

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application. Claims 52-72 are pending. Claims 56 and 65 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added.

Claims 52, 56, 61, 65, and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection on claims 52, 61, and 70. Support and description of the limitation at issue can be found on, for example, page 10, line 16 through page 11, line 7 of the specification and Figure 2. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 56 and 65 have been amended to remove the limitation at issue. It is respectfully submitted that the amendment has overcome the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 52-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis (U.S. Patent No. 6,526,506) in view of Quick, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 6,178,506, hereinafter Quick) and further in view of Schneier ("Applied Cryptography, Second Edition, Protocols, Algorithms, and Source Code in C", John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1996, hereinafter Schneier). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 52 sets forth:

- the access point receiving a connection request from the station to initiate a setup connection between the access point and the station;
- the access point sending a shared key to the station in response to the connection request if the access point is capable of handling a connection to the station;
- the access point selecting a secret access point key subsequent to sending the shared key;
- the access point generating a self-distributed key using the secret access point key;

the access point generating a first value using the secret access point key and a second value from the station, wherein the second value has been generated by the station using a secret station key;

the access point sending the first value to the station, wherein the station uses the first value and the secret station key to calculate the self-distributed key;

the access point receiving an encrypted user name and an encrypted password from the station, wherein ***the station has encrypted the user name and the password with the self-distributed key***; and

the access point decrypting the user name and password to check for validity.

(Claim 52) (emphasis added)

As stated in the Office Action, Lewis does not disclose the user name and password being encrypted with a self-distributed key (Office Action, p. 4, last paragraph). However, the Office Action argued that Schneier discloses the Hughes encryption scheme for generating self-distributed key and Quick discloses when communicating with access point, mobile terminal user should protect secrecy of password, either in encrypted form or not, citing Quick, col. 4, ln. 36-37 (Office Action, p. 4, last paragraph). It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action has mis-interpreted Quick, which in fact, teaches away from making the proposed modification.

According to Quick, it is ***not necessary*** that the terminal and home system exchange passwords nor session keys in encrypted form (Quick, col. 4, ln. 29-31). Furthermore, if the password is ***not included*** in the message, ***even in encrypted form***, then, according to Quick, it is more difficult to be compromised (Quick, col. 4, ln. 36-37). Contrary to the above assertion in the Office Action, Quick explicitly teaches away from including an encrypted password in the message in order to protect the password. Therefore, in view of such discouragement from Quick, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify Lewis by Quick and Schneier as proposed in the Office Action. For at least this reason, claim 52 is patentable over Lewis in view of Quick and Schneier. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 52, claims 56, 61, 65, and 70 are patentable over Lewis in view of Quick and Schneier. Claims 53-55, 57-60, 62-64, 66-69, and 71-72 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 52, 56, 61, 65, and 70, respectively, and thus, are patentable over Lewis in view of Quick and Schneier. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome by the remarks, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the pending claims be allowed.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a)(3), Applicants hereby request and authorize the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to (1) treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time and (2) charge all required fees, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 11/14, 2008



Chui-kiu Teresa Wong
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 48,042

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085
(408) 720-8300